arXiv:1612.05875v1 [math.PR] 18 Dec 2016

Unique strong solutions of Lévy processes driven stochastic differential equations with discontinuous coefficients *

Jiayu Zheng, Jie Xiong and Xiaowen Zhou

Abstract

We establish the existence and uniqueness for a one-dimensional stochastic differential equation driven by a Brownian motion and a pure jump Lévy process. It is shown that under fairly general conditions on the coefficients, pathwise uniqueness holds based on the methods of weak uniqueness and local time technique.

Keywords: Stochastic differential equation, time change, weak uniqueness, pathwise uniqueness, Lévy processes, local time.

1 Introduction

Suppose that U is a complete separable metric space and that $\mu(du)$ is a σ-finite Borel measure on U. Suppose that $\sigma(x)$ and $b(x)$ are Borel functions on $\mathbb{R}$, which have at most countably many discontinuous points; $g(x,u)$ is a Borel function on $\mathbb{R}\times U$ which has at most countably many discontinuous points.

Let $\{B_t\}$ be a standard $(\mathscr{F}_t)$-Brownian motion and let $\{p_t\}$ be $(\mathscr{F}_t)$-Poisson point processes on U with characteristic measure $\mu(du)$. Suppose that $\{B_t\}$, $\{p_t\}$ are independent of each other.

Let $N(ds,du)$ be the Poisson random measures on $\mathbb{R}_+\times U$ associated with $\{p_t\}$. In this paper, we will study the solution to the stochastic differential equation (1.1) given below. By a solution of the stochastic equation

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(X_{s-})ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_{s-})dB_s + \int_0^t\int_U g(X_{s-},u)N(ds,du) \tag{1.1}$$

*JZ and JX's research is supported by Macao Science and Technology Fund FDCT 076/2012/A3 and Multi-Year Research Grants of the University of Macau No. MYRG2014-00015-FST and MYRG2014-00034-FST. XZ's research is supported by an NSERC grant.

we mean a càdlàg and $(\mathscr{F}_t)$-adapted process $\{X_t\}$ that satisfies the equation almost surely for every $t \geq 0$. Since $X_{s-} \neq X_s$ for at most countable many $s \geq 0$, we can also use X_s instead of X_{s-} in the integrals with respect to dB_s and ds on the right hand side of (1.1).

The question of pathwise uniqueness for one-dimensional stochastic differential equations with non-Lipschitz coefficients driven by one-dimensional Brownian motion has been resolved long time ago by Yamada and Watanabe [17]. Recently, stochastic differential equations of jump type attracted a lot of research attention. Bass [4] and Komatsu [9] show that the following stochastic differential equations driven by discontinuous Lévy noises

$$dX_t = F(X_{t-})dL_t, \quad t \geq 0 \tag{1.2}$$

admits a strong solution and satisfies pathwise uniqueness if $\{L_t\}$ is a symmetric stable process with exponent $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and if $x \to F(x)$ is a bounded function with modulus of continuity $z \to \rho(z)$ satisfying

$$\int_{0+} \frac{1}{\rho(z)^\alpha} dz = \infty. \tag{1.3}$$

When the integral in (1.3) is finite, Bass *et al* constructed a continuous function $x \to \Phi(x)$ having continuity modulus $x \to \rho(x)$ for which the pathwise uniqueness for (1.2) fails, see [3]. Recall that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the paths of L_t are of bounded variation, while for $\alpha \in [1, 2)$ they are of unbounded variation.

It is well-known that if the coefficients are assumed to be Lipschitz continuous, then the existence of strong solutions and pathwise uniqueness can be obtained by Gronwall's inequality and the results on continuous-type equations; see e.g. Ikeda and Watanabe [7]. This condition has been improved by Fu and Li [6]. They proved the pathwise uniqueness for non-negative càdlàg solutions driven by spectrally positive Lévy noises under Lipschitz and non-Lipschitz conditions and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Li and Mythik [13] extended the result to any càdlàg solutions, all these works require that the coefficients to be continuous.

By using Gronwall's inequality and the technique of local time, Bouhadou and Ouknine [5] proved that under the so-called (LT) condition, the pathwise uniqueness holds when the diffusion coefficient is discontinuous. However, the proof still depends on the continuity of the drift and the Lévy noises coefficients. In addition, the paper did not prove the weak existence when the diffusion coefficient is discontinuous.

The so-called (LT) condition was introduced by Barlow and Perkins [2] as another tool to prove the pathwise uniqueness. This is also used by Le Gall to deal with the case of the stochastic equations which involve the local time [12]. The importance of (LT) lies in the following observation: if the diffusion coefficient σ satisfies (LT), and X^1 and X^2 are two solutions, then so is $X^1 \vee X^2$, which follows immediately from Tanaka's formula. If weak uniqueness holds, then satisfying (LT) implies pathwise uniqueness.

Ren [15] prove the result of weak uniqueness for stochastic equations with one-side jumps for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, with continuous coefficients. She use the weak uniqueness and the existence of strong solution together to prove the pathwise uniqueness, while the existence of strong solution heavily depends on the one-side stable process. In the present paper, we consider

the weak uniqueness for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, under which the condition on coefficients could be weaken substantially and finally, with the (LT) condition, we prove pathwise uniqueness.

This paper is arranged as following: In Section 2 we prove the existence of weak solution by a martingale approach. In Section 3, we obtain the weak uniqueness by verifying the separating condition of Kurtz and Ocone [10]. Pathwise uniqueness is then proved in Section 4 under (LT) condition. Some sufficient conditions for (LT) are then presented. Finally, an example from reality which motives our research is discussed in Section 5.

2 Weak existence

In this section, we study the existence of weak solutions of (1.1). We will first define an approximating sequence and prove its tightness. To characterize the limit, we then prove that the limit will not spend too much time at the points at which the coefficients are not continuous. Finally, we pass to the limit to get a weak solution to SDE (1.1).

We begin with the introduction of the following condition:

(2.a) There is a constant $K \geq 0$ such that

$$b(x)^2 + \sigma(x)^2 + \int_U \left[|g(x,u)| \vee g(x,u)^2\right] \mu(du) \leq K, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R};$$

(2.b) There is a constant $\sigma_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$|\sigma(x)| \geq \sigma_0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that $\sigma(x), b(x), g(x,u)$ are bounded measurable functions and have at most countably many discontinuous points. Now, we construct a sequence of smooth functions to approximate them.

Let

$$b_n(x) = \mathbb{E}\left(b(x+\xi_n)\right),$$

where ξ_n is a normal random variable with mean 0 and variance $\frac{1}{n}$. Let σ_n and g_n be defined similarly.

By condition (2.a), it is easy to check that

$$b_n(x)^2 + \sigma_n(x)^2 + \int_U \left[|g_n(x,u)| \vee g_n(x,u)^2\right] \mu(du) \leq K, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For each $n \geq 1$, the functions $(\sigma_n(x), b_n(x), g_n(x,\cdot))$, taking values in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times L^2(U,\mu)$, are Lipschitz continuous in x. Then for every $n \geq 1$, by a well-known result on stochastic equations (see [6])), there is a unique strong solution to

$$X_t^n = X_0 + \int_0^t b_n(X_{s-}^n)ds + \int_0^t \sigma_n(X_{s-}^n)dB_s + \int_0^t \int_U g_n(X_{s-}^n, u)N(ds,du).$$

Next, we pass to the limit. We first need a tightness result.

Lemma 2.1. *For any solution X^n of (1.1) and $t > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\le s<t}(X_s^n)^2\right] \le 5\mathbb{E}(X_0^n)^2 + 20Kt + 5K^2t^2$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^n &= X_0^n + \int_0^t b_n(X_{s-}^n)ds + \int_0^t \sigma_n(X_{s-}^n)dB_s + \int_0^t\int_U g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)N(ds,du) \\ &= X_0^n + \int_0^t b_n(X_{s-}^n)ds + \int_0^t \sigma_n(X_{s-}^n)dB_s + \int_0^t\int_U g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)\widetilde{N}(ds,du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t ds\int_U g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)\mu(du) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

By applying Doob's inequality to the martingale terms in (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\le s<t}(X_s^n)^2] \le& 5\mathbb{E}(X_0^n)^2 + 5\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^t |b_n(X_{s-}^n)|ds\right)^2\right] + 20\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \sigma_n(X_{s-}^n)^2ds\right] \\ &+ 20\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t ds\int_U g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)^2\mu(du)\right] \\ &+ 5\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^t ds\int_U |g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)|\mu(du)\right)^2\right] \\ \le& 5\mathbb{E}(X_0^n)^2 + 5t\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t |b_n(X_{s-}^n)|^2ds\right] + 20Kt \\ &+ 5t\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\left(\int_U |g_n(X_{s-}^n,u)|\mu(du)\right)^2 ds\right] \\ \le& 5\mathbb{E}(X_0^n)^2 + 20Kt + 5K^2t^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.1. *The sequence $\{X^n\}$ is tight in the Skorohod space $D([0,\infty),\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Since X_0 is deterministic, by Proposition 2.1 , $\sup_{n\ge1}\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\le s<t}(X_s^n)^2]$ is locally bounded. Then for every fixed $t \ge 0$ the sequence of random variables $\{X_t^n\}$ is tight. Moreover, if $\{\tau_n\}$ is a sequence of stopping times bounded above by $T \ge 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[|X_{\tau_n+t}^n - X_{\tau_n}^n|^2\right] \le& 4t\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t b_n(X_{\tau_n+s-}^n)^2ds\right] + 4\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \sigma_n(X_{\tau_n+s-}^n)^2ds\right] \\ &+ 4\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t ds\int_U g_n(X_{\tau_n+s-}^n,u)^2\mu(du)\right] \\ &+ 4t\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\left(\int_U g_n(X_{\tau_n+s-}^n,u)\mu(du)\right)^2 ds\right] \\ \le& 4Kt(1+Kt) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, as $t \to 0$,

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\left[|X^n_{\tau_n+t} - X^n_{\tau_n}|^2\right] \to 0.$$

Then $\{X^n\}$ is tight in $D([0,\infty),\mathbb{R})$ by the criterion of Aldous [1]; see also Ethier and Kurtz([10], pp. 137-138). □

Let X be a limit point of the sequence $\{X^n\}$. We proceed to proving that X is a solution to SDE (1.1). Because of the discontinuity, we need the following result on the time that the limit possibly spent on the discontinuity points.

Lemma 2.2. *The level set of the process X at level C is defined as $\{t : X_t = C\}$. Then the level set has Lebesgue measure 0 for any C.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we consider the case of $C = 0$. Denote

$$M^n_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \sigma_n(X^n_{s-})dB_s$$

and

$$Z^n_t = -\int_0^t b_n(X^n_{s-})ds - \int_0^t \int_U g_n(X^n_{s-}, u)N(ds, du).$$

Similar to last lemma, we can prove the tightness of $(X^n, M^n, Z^n, \langle M^n\rangle)$. Let (X, M, Z, A) be a limit point. Then, $X = M - Z$, M and $M^2 - A$ are martingales, and Z and A are of finite variations on $[0, T]$ for any $T > 0$.

Let $F = \{t \in [0, T] : M_t = Z_t\}$. Suppose $|F| > 0$.

Since M_t is continuous, $\forall\epsilon > 0$, $\exists\delta > 0$, for any $s, t \in [0, T]$, $|M_t - M_s| < \epsilon$, whenever $|t-s| < \delta$. Now we can find a finite number of points: $0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq a_2 < b_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_n < b_n$, such that $F \subset \cup_{i=1}^n [a_i, b_i]$, $|b_i - a_i| < \delta$, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - a_i| < |F| + \epsilon.$$

Choose $\bar{a}_i = \inf\{[a_i, b_i] \cap F\}$ and $\bar{b}_i = \sup\{[a_i, b_i] \cap F\}$, let $J = \{i : \bar{a}_i = \bar{b}_i\}$, then $\cup_{i\notin J}[\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_i]$ covers F, except finite points. For any $i \notin J$, if $\bar{a}_i \notin F$ and $\bar{b}_i \notin F$, we may take $a'_i \in F \cap (\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_i + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} \wedge \frac{\bar{b}_i - \bar{a}_i}{2})$, $b'_i \in F \cap (\bar{b}_i - \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} \wedge \frac{\bar{b}_i - \bar{a}_i}{2}, \bar{b}_i)$ be such that

$$0 < \bar{b}_i - \bar{a}_i - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{i-1}} < b'_i - a'_i.$$

Now we use $\frac{\delta}{2^n}$ to replace δ, then we have the following fact

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_i \left((M_{b'_i} - M_{a'_i})^2 - (\langle M\rangle_{b'_i} - \langle M\rangle_{a'_i})\right) = 0, \ a.s.$$

and thus for δ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i (M_{b_i'} - M_{a_i'})^2 &\geq \sum_i \left(\langle M \rangle_{b_i'} - \langle M \rangle_{a_i'} \right) - \epsilon \\ &\geq \sigma_0^2 \sum_i (b_i' - a_i') - \epsilon \\ &\geq \sigma_0^2 \left(\sum_i (\bar{b}_i - \bar{a}_i) - 2\epsilon \right) - \epsilon \\ &\geq \sigma_0^2 |F| - (2\sigma_0^2 + 1)\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\sum_i (M_{b_i'} - M_{a_i'})^2 \leq \epsilon \sum_i |M_{b_i'} - M_{a_i'}| = \epsilon \sum_i |Z_{b_i'} - Z_{a_i'}| \leq \epsilon TV(Z_t, F).$$

Thus,

$$\sigma_0^2 |F| - (2\sigma_0^2 + 1)\epsilon \leq \epsilon TV(Z_t, F).$$

Taking $\epsilon \to 0$, we get a contradiction, and hence, finish the proof. □

Theorem 2.1. *Under condition (2.a) there exists a weak solution to (1.1).*

Proof. By the Skorohod representation theorem, we may assume those processes are defined on the same probability space and $\{X_t^{n_k} : t \geq 0\}$ converges to $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ almost surely in $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$.

Let

$$\Lambda = \{t : \ X_t = X_{t-} \text{ is not a discontinuity point of } b, \, \sigma, \text{ or } g\}.$$

Since $\xi_n \to 0$ in probability, for all $s \in \Lambda$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} b_n(X_{s-}^n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_n} b(X_{s-}^n + \xi_n) = b(X_{s-}),$$

where E_{ξ_n} is the expectation with respect to the random variable ξ_n. Similar identities also hold for σ_n and g_n.

Denote $O = \{s : X. \text{ is discontinuous at } s\}$. Since $X_{s-} \neq X_s$ for at most countably many $s \geq 0$ and functions $b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot), g(\cdot)$ have at most countable discontinuous points which we denote by $\{c_i^b\}, \{c_i^\sigma\}, \{c_i^g\}$, respectively, then

$$\Lambda^c \subset (\cup_{i=1}^\infty \{s : X_s = c_i^b\}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^\infty \{s : X_s = c_i^\sigma\}) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^\infty \{s : X_s = c_i^g\}) \cup O.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have $\text{Leb}(\Lambda^c) = 0$ a.s.

Note that for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned}M_t^{n,f} &= f(X_t^n) - \int_0^t \left(b_n(X_{s-}^n) f'(X_{s-}^n) + \frac{1}{2} f''(X_{s-}^n) \sigma_n^2(X_{s-}^n) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_U \left(f(X_{s-}^n + g_n(X_{s-}^n, u)) - f(X_{s-}^n) \right) \mu(du) ds \qquad (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

is a martingale.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} M_t^{n,f} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} f(X_t^n) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t \left(b_n(X_{s-}^n) f'(X_{s-}^n) + \frac{1}{2} f''(X_{s-}^n) \sigma_n^2(X_{s-}^n) \right) ds \\
&\quad - \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t \int_U \left(f(X_{s-}^n + g_n(X_{s-}^n, u)) - f(X_{s-}^n) \right) \mu(du) ds \qquad (2.6) \\
&= f(X_t) - \int_0^t \left(b(X_{s-}) f'(X_{s-}) + \frac{1}{2} f''(X_{s-}) \sigma(X_{s-})^2 \right) ds \\
&\quad - \int_0^t \int_U \left(f(X_{s-} + g(X_{s-}, u)) - f(X_{s-}) \right) \mu(du) ds \qquad (2.7) \\
&\equiv M_t^f \qquad (2.8)
\end{aligned}$$

is a martingale. That is to say, X is a solution to the martingale problem corresponding to (1.1). Therefore, it is a weak solution of that equation, and hence, the weak existence holds. □

3 Weak uniqueness

In this section, we impose the following condition:

(3.a)There exists a constant $K \geq 0$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$|b(x)| + \int_U |g(x,u)| \mu(du) \leq K \sigma(x)^2,$$

(3.b) $0 < |\sigma(x)| \leq K, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let A be an operator on $B(\mathbb{R})$. The domain of A is denoted by $\mathscr{D}(A)$ and the range of A is denoted by $\mathscr{R}(A)$. A measurable stochastic process X is a solution of the martingale problem for A if there exists a filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$ such that

$$f(X_t) - \int_0^t Af(X_t) ds$$

is an $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$-martingale for each $f \in \mathscr{D}(A)$.

Let v_t denote the distribution of X_t. We say that $M \subset B(\mathbb{R})$ is separating (for $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R})$) if $v, \mu \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R})$ and $vf = \mu f$ for all $f \in M$ implies $v = \mu$.

Now we use the following proposition which is given by Kurtz and Ocone [10] to prove the weak uniqueness in general.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $\mathscr{R}(\lambda - A)$ is separating for each $\lambda > 0$. If $\{v_t\}$ and $\{\mu_t\}$ satisfy*

$$v_t f = v_0 f + \int_0^t v_s A f ds, \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(A)$$

are weakly right continuous and $v_0 = \mu_0$, then $v_t = \mu_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 3.1. *Note that if $\mathscr{R}(\lambda - A)$ is separating for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \infty)$, then the above proposition still holds.*

From the SDE (1.1), for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R})$, M_t^f is a martingale. Let

$$\tau_t = \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)^2 ds \text{ and } \widetilde{X}_t = X_{\tau_t^{-1}}.$$

Note that (1.1) is

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(X_{s-})ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_{s-})dB_s + \int_0^t \int_U g(X_{s-}, u)N(ds, du).$$

Let

$$W_t = \int_0^{\tau_t^{-1}} \sigma(X_{s-})dB_s.$$

Then W_t is a Brownian motion.

Let $s = \tau_r^{-1}$. It is easy to see that

$$ds = \frac{dr}{\sigma(X_s)^2} = \frac{dr}{\sigma(\widetilde{X}_r)^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\widetilde{X}_t = X_0 + W_t + \int_0^t (\sigma^{-2}b)(\widetilde{X}_{s-})ds + \int_0^{\tau_t^{-1}} \int_U g(\widetilde{X}_{s-}, u)N(ds, du)$$

Since we will consider discontinuous functions, we first define the semigroup of the Brownian motion in the space $\mathbb{B}$ of all bounded functions with supremum norm as follows

$$T_t f(x) = \int_R p_t(x - y)f(y)dy, \qquad \forall\ f \in \mathbb{B},$$

where $p_t(x-y)$ is the transition density, and $T_0 f(x) = f(x)$. Let $A_0 f = \frac{1}{2}f''$ be the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup $\{T_t, t \geq 0\}$ on $\mathbb{B}$ with $D(A_0) = \{f :\ f,\ f',\ f'' \in \mathbb{B}\}$.

Let $D(A) = D(A_0)$ and $A = A_0 + B + C$, where

$$Af(x) = \frac{1}{2}f''(x) + \frac{b(x)}{\sigma(x)^2}f'(x) + \frac{1}{\sigma(x)^2}\int_U (f(x + g(x, u)) - f(x))\mu(du),$$

$$A_0 f(x) = \frac{1}{2}f''(x),$$

$$Bf(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma(x)^2}\int_U (f(x + g(x, u)) - f(x))\mu(du),$$

and

$$Cf(x) = \frac{b(x)}{\sigma(x)^2} f'(x).$$

By Itô's formula, we get that for any $f \in D(A)$,

$$\mathbb{E}f(\widetilde{X}_t) = \mathbb{E}f(\widetilde{X}_0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}Af(\widetilde{X}_s)ds. \tag{3.9}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Under condition (3.a,b), the weak uniqueness holds for the equation (3.9), and hence, also for the time changed SDE.*

Proof. We proceed to proving that $\mathscr{R}(\lambda - A)$ is separating. Let $\lambda > 0$ be arbitrary, define $R_\lambda f = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T_t f dt$. Let $g \in \mathbb{B}$. We hope to show that there exists $f \in D(A)$ such that $(\lambda - A)f = g$. Namely, we need to solve

$$(\lambda - A_0)f = g + (B + C)f. \tag{3.10}$$

We first solve

$$f = R_\lambda(g + Bf + Cf) \equiv \Gamma(f). \tag{3.11}$$

Let $\mathbb{B}^1 = \{f \in C^1(R) \cap \mathbb{B} : \ f' \in \mathbb{B}\}$ with norm

$$\|f\|_1 = \sup_x |f(x)| + \sup_x |f'(x)|.$$

It is clear that B and C are bounded linear operators from $\mathbb{B}^1$ to $\mathbb{B}$ since

$$\begin{aligned} |Bf(x)| =& \frac{1}{\sigma(x)^2} \left| \int_U \left(f(x + g(x,u)) - f(x)\right) \mu(du) \right| \\ \leq& \frac{\|f\|_1}{\sigma(x)^2} \left| \int_U g(x,u)\mu(du) \right| \\ \leq& K\|f\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|Cf(x)| = \frac{|b(x)|}{\sigma(x)^2} |f'(x)| < \infty.$$

On the other hand, for $f \in \mathbb{B}$, we have

$$|T_t f(x)| \leq \|f\|_1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x T_t f(x)| &= \left| \int_R \partial_x p_t(x - z) f(z) dz \right| \\ &\leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{t}} \int_R p_{2t}(x - z) dz \|f\|_1 \\ &= \frac{K}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Hence, T_t is a bounded linear operator from $\mathbb{B}$ to $\mathbb{B}^1$ whose norm is bounded by $(1+Kt^{-1/2})$. Thus, for $f \in \mathbb{B}^1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|R_\lambda(B+C)f\|_1 &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\|T_t\|_{L(\mathbb{B},\mathbb{B}^1)}\|B+C\|_{L(\mathbb{B}^1,\mathbb{B})}\|f\|_1 dt \\ &\leq K\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}(1+Kt^{-1/2})dt\|f\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Take λ large enough, we see that there exists $0 < L < 1$ such that $R_\lambda(B+C)$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathbb{B}^1$ whose norm is bounded by L. Therefore, Γ is a contraction mapping on $\mathbb{B}^1$. Choose λ_0 large enough such that $0 < L < 1$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. There exists a unique $f \in \mathbb{B}^1$ such that (3.11) is satisfied.

To prove that f is the solution of (3.10), we denote $h = g + Bf + Cf$. We now consider the following ODE:

$$\lambda l(x) - \frac{1}{2}l''(x) = h(x) \tag{3.13}$$

It is well-known that the above ODE has a solution

$$l(x) = e^{\sqrt{2\lambda}x}\int_x^\infty \frac{h(y)}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}e^{-\sqrt{2\lambda}y}dy + e^{-\sqrt{2\lambda}x}\int_{-\infty}^x \frac{h(y)}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}e^{\sqrt{2\lambda}y}dy.$$

It is easy to check the above solution has a bounded second derivative. Next, we want to show that the solution l of (3.13) is exactly the solution of (3.11).

Applying R_λ to both sides of (3.13), we have

$$R_\lambda(\lambda l - \frac{1}{2}l'') = R_\lambda h$$

Since $R_\lambda h = f$, and

$$\begin{aligned}R_\lambda(\lambda l - \frac{1}{2}l'') &= \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}T_t l(x)dt - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}T_t l''(x)dt \\ &= \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}T_t l(x)dt - \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\frac{d}{dt}\left(T_t l(x)\right)dt \\ &= l,\end{aligned}$$

Then $f = l$. f is not only in $\mathbb{B}^1$, but also has a bounded second derivative, and hence, it is in $D(A_0) = D(A)$. This implies that $\mathscr{R}(\lambda - A) = \mathbb{B}$, and hence, separating for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$.

Let $\widetilde{X}_t$ and $\widetilde{Y}_t$ be solutions of (3.9) with distributions ν_t and μ_t, respectively. By (3.9), we have

$$v_t f = v_0 f + \int_0^t v_s A f ds, \quad f \in \mathscr{D}(A),$$

Perform Laplace transform,

$$\lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\nu_t f dt = \nu_0 f + \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\nu_t A f ds,$$

consequently,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\nu_t(\lambda f - Af)dt = \nu_0 f, \quad f \in D(A) \tag{3.14}$$

equivalently,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\mu_t(\lambda f - Af)dt = \mu_0 f, \quad f \in D(A) \tag{3.15}$$

Since $\mathscr{R}(\lambda - A)$ is separating for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, (3.14) and (3.15) implies that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}(\nu_t - \mu_t)dt = 0, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}(\nu_t - \mu_t)dt &= \int_0^\infty e^{-(\lambda-\lambda_0)t}e^{\lambda_0}(\nu_t - \mu_t)dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt}e^{\lambda_0}(\nu_t - \mu_t)dt \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

The above equation holds for all $r > 0$, if $\{\nu_t\}$ and $\{\mu_t\}$ is weakly right continuous, then the uniqueness of the Laplace transform implies $e^{\lambda_0}(\nu_t - \mu_t) = 0$, and hence,

$$\nu_t = \mu_t, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Suppose X_t and Y_t are two solutions of the original SDE, $\tau_t = \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)^2 ds$ and $\lambda_t = \int_0^t \sigma(Y_s)^2 ds$. The distributions of the time changed processes $\widetilde{X}_t = X_{\tau_t^{-1}}$ and $\widetilde{Y}_t = Y_{\lambda_t^{-1}}$ satisfy (3.9). Hence, $\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{X}) = \mathcal{L}(\widetilde{Y})$. It is easy to show that

$$\tau_t^{-1} = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sigma(\widetilde{X}_s)^2}ds \equiv \mathcal{G}(\widetilde{X}),$$

and

$$\lambda_t^{-1} = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sigma(\widetilde{Y}_s)^2}ds \equiv \mathcal{G}(\widetilde{Y}).$$

As $X_t = \widetilde{X}_{\tau_t}$ and $Y_t = \widetilde{Y}_{\lambda_t}$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y).$$

That is, the weak uniqueness of the original SDE holds.

□

4 Pathwise uniqueness

In this section, we prove some results on the pathwise uniqueness of solutions to (1.1) under condition (3.a,b). In addition, we consider the following conditions:

(4.a)For any fixed u, $g(\cdot,u)+\cdot$ is non-decreasing ;

(4.b)There exist constants $\sigma_0, K \geq 0$, such that $0<\sigma_0 \leq |\sigma(x)| \leq K$ for all x.

As is known, the solutions of (1.1) is a semimartingale that is discontinuous. To prove the pathwise uniqueness, we consider the local times of semimartingales which is introduced in Section 4.7 of Protter [14]. The following Tanaka formula appears in the Theorem 68.

Theorem 4.1. *(Tanaka's Formula) Let X be a semimartingale and let L^a be its local time at a. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}(X_t-a)^+-(X_0-a)^+ =& \int_{0+}^t 1_{\{X_{s-}>a\}}dX_s+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{\{X_{s-}>a\}}(X_s-a)^-\\ &+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{\{X_{s-}\leq a\}}(X_s-a)^+ +\frac{1}{2}L_t^a\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(X_t-a)^--(X_0-a)^- =& -\int_{0+}^t 1_{\{X_{s-}\leq a\}}dX_s+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{\{X_{s-}>a\}}(X_s-a)^-\\ &+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{\{X_{s-}\leq a\}}(X_s-a)^+ +\frac{1}{2}L_t^a,\end{aligned}$$

where L^a denotes the local time process of X at a.

Proposition 4.1. *Under condition (4.a), if X^1 and X^2 are two solutions of (1.1) such that $X_0^1=X_0^2$ a.s., then $X^1\vee X^2$ is a solution if and only if $L^0(X^1-X^2)$ vanishes identically.*

Proof. Since X^1 and X^2 are semimartingales, by Tanaka's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}X_t^1\vee X_t^2 =&X_t^1+(X_t^2-X_t^1)^+\\ =&X_t^1+\int_{0+}^t 1_{(X_{s-}^2>X_{s-}^1)}d(X^2-X^1)_s+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X_{s-}^2>X_{s-}^1)}(X_s^2-X_s^1)^-\\ &+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X_{s-}^2\leq X_{s-}^1)}(X_s^2-X_s^1)^+ +\frac{1}{2}L_t^0(X^2-X^1).\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

Denote by D the collection of jumping times of N. Then

$$\begin{aligned}X_s^2-X_s^1 =&X_{s-}^2-X_{s-}^1+\Delta X_s^2-\Delta X_s^1\\ =&X_{s-}^2-X_{s-}^1+\Big(g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)\Big)1_D(s).\end{aligned}$$

By the non-decreasing property of $x+g(x,u)$ in x, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&1_{(X_{s-}^2>X_{s-}^1)}(X_s^2-X_s^1)^-\\ =&1_{(X_{s-}^2>X_{s-}^1)}\left[X_{s-}^2-X_{s-}^1+\Big(g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)\Big)1_D(s)\right]^-\\ =&0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{0<s\le t} 1_{(X^2_{s-}>X^1_{s-})}(X^2_s - X^1_s)^- = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{0<s\le t} 1_{(X^2_{s-}\le X^1_{s-})}(X^2_s - X^1_s)^+ = 0.$$

Replacing $X^i (i = 1, 2)$ in (4.17) by

$$X^i_0 + \int_0^t b(X^i_{s-})ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X^i_{s-})dB_s + \int_0^t \int_U g(X^i_{s-}, u)N(ds, du),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X^1_t \vee X^2_t =& X^1_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(X^1_{s-})dB_s + \int_0^t b(X^1_{s-})ds + \int_0^t \int_U g(X^1_{s-}, u)N(ds, du) \\ &+ \int_{0+}^t 1_{(X^2_{s-}>X^1_{s-})}(\sigma(X^2_{s-}) - \sigma(X^1_{s-}))dB_s \\ &+ \int_{0+}^t 1_{(X^2_{s-}>X^1_{s-})}(b(X^2_{s-}) - b(X^1_{s-}))ds \\ &+ \int_{0+}^t \int_U 1_{(X^2_{s-}>X^1_{s-})}(g(X^2_{s-}, u) - g(X^1_{s-}, u))N(ds, du) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}L^0_t(X^2 - X^1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

We now simplify (4.18) to get

$$\begin{aligned} X^1_t \vee X^2_t =& X^1_0 + \int_0^t (1_{(X^2_s\le X^1_s)}\sigma(X^1_{s-}) + 1_{(X^2_s>X^1_s)}\sigma(X^2_{s-}))dB_s \\ &+ \int_0^t (1_{(X^2_s\le X^1_s)}b(X^1_{s-}) + 1_{(X^2_s>X^1_s)}b(X^2_s))ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_U (1_{(X^2_s\le X^1_s)}g(X^1_{s-}, u) + 1_{(X^2_s>X^1_s)}g(X^2_{s-}, u))N(ds, du) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}L^0_t(X^2 - X^1) \\ =& X^1_0 \vee X^2_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(X^1_{s-} \vee X^2_{s-})dB_s + \int_0^t b(X^1_{s-} \vee X^2_s)dB_s \\ &+ \int_{0+}^t \int_U (g(X^2_{s-}, u) \vee g(X^1_{s-}, u))N(ds, du) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}L^0_t(X^2 - X^1), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 4.2. *If uniqueness in law holds for (1.1) and $L^0(X^1 - X^2) = 0$ for any pair (X^1, X^2) of solutions such that $X^1_0 = X^2_0$ a.s., then pathwise uniqueness holds for (1.1).*

Proof. If X^1 and X^2 are two solutions, and $L^0(X^1 - X^2) = 0$, then $X^1 \vee X^2$ is also a solution. Since the weak uniqueness holds, then we have

$$\mathcal{L}(X^1) = \mathcal{L}(X^2) = \mathcal{L}(X^1 \vee X^2)$$

and $X^1 \vee X^2 - X^1$ is a non-negative random variable, then

$$\mathbb{E}[X^1 \vee X^2 - X^1] = 0$$

so $X^1 \vee X^2 = X^1$ a.s.. Similarly, we have $X^1 \vee X^2 = X^2$ a.s., which implies $X^2 = X^1$ a.s.. □

The next lemma is crucial to check the above condition on the local time.

Lemma 4.1. *Under conditions (2.a) and (4.a), if X^1 and X^2 are two solutions of (1.1), then $\mathbb{E}\left[L_t^a(X^1 - X^2)\right] \to \mathbb{E}\left[L_t^0(X^1 - X^2)\right]$ as $a \to 0+$.*

Proof. By Tanaka's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}L_t^a(X^1 - X^2) =& (X_t^1 - X_t^2 - a)^- - (X_0^1 - X_0^2 - a)^- \\
&+ \int_{0+}^t 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} d(X_s^1 - X_s^2) \\
&- \sum_{0<s\le t} 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 > a)} (X_s^1 - X_s^2 - a)^- \\
&- \sum_{0<s\le t} 1_{(X^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} (X_s^1 - X_s^2 - a)^+ \\
\equiv& I_1^a + I_2^a - I_3^a - I_4^a.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|I_1^a - I_1^0| \le 2a$, then $\mathbb{E}(I_1^a - I_1^0) \to 0$, as $a \to 0+$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2^a - I_2^0 =& \int_{0+}^t \left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(b(X_{s-}^1) - b(X_{s-}^2)\right) ds \\
&+ \int_{0+}^t \left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(\sigma(X_{s-}^1) - \sigma(X_{s-}^2)\right) dB_s \\
&+ \int_{0+}^t \int_U \left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(g(X_{s-}^1, u) - g(X_{s-}^2, u)\right) N(ds, du).
\end{aligned}$$

By condition (2.a),

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{0+}^t \left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(\sigma(X_{s-}^1) - \sigma(X_{s-}^2)\right) dB_s = 0,$$

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{0+}^t \left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(b(X_{s-}^1) - b(X_{s-}^2)\right) ds \to 0.$$

$$\left|\left(1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le a)} - 1_{(X_{s-}^1 - X_{s-}^2 \le 0)}\right) \left(g(X_{s-}^1, u) - g(X_{s-}^2, u)\right)\right| \le |g(X_{s-}^1, u)| + |g(X_{s-}^2, u)|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_{0+}^{t}\int_{U}\left(|g(X_{s-}^{1},u)|+|g(X_{s-}^{2},u)|\right)N(ds,du)\\=&\mathbb{E}\int_{0+}^{t}\int_{U}\left(|g(X_{s-}^{1},u)|+|g(X_{s-}^{2},u)|\right)\mu(du)ds\\\leq&2Kt<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{a\to 0+}\mathbb{E}\int_{0+}^{t}\int_{U}\left(1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a)}-1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq 0)}\right)\left(g(X_{s-}^{1},u)-g(X_{s-}^{2},u)\right)N(ds,du)\\=&\mathbb{E}\int_{0+}^{t}\int_{U}\lim_{a\to 0+}\left(1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a)}-1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq 0)}\right)\left(g(X_{s-}^{1},u)-g(X_{s-}^{2},u)\right)N(ds,du)\\=&0.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathbb{E}I_2^a \to \mathbb{E}I_2^0$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a)}(X_s^1-X_s^2-a)^+\\=&\sum_{0<s\leq t}\left(1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a,X_{s-}^{1}\leq X_{s-}^{2})}+1_{(X_{s-}^{2}<X_{s-}^{1}\leq a+X_{s-}^{2})}\right)\left[X_{s-}^1-X_{s-}^2-a+(\Delta X_s^1-\Delta X_s^2)\right]^+\\=&\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a,X_{s-}^{1}\leq X_{s-}^{2})}\left[X_{s-}^1-X_{s-}^2-a+\left(g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)\right)1_D(s)\right]^+\\&+\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X_{s-}^{2}<X_{s-}^{1}\leq a+X_{s-}^{2})}\left[X_{s-}^1-X_{s-}^2-a+\left(g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)\right)1_D(s)\right]^+\\=&S_1+S_2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

Under condition (4.a), since $x+g(x,u)$ is non-decreasing in x, then,

$$\begin{aligned}S_1=&\sum_{s\in D\cap[0,t]}1_{(X_{s-}^{1}-X_{s-}^{2}\leq a,X_{s-}^{1}\leq X_{s-}^{2})}\left[X_{s-}^1-X_{s-}^2-a+g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)\right]^+\\=&0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}S_2=&\sum_{s\in D\cap[0,t]}1_{(X_{s-}^{2}<X_{s-}^{1}\leq a+X_{s-}^{2})}\left[X_{s-}^1-X_{s-}^2-a+g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)\right]^+\\\leq&\sum_{s\in D\cap[0,t]}1_{(X_{s-}^{2}<X_{s-}^{1}\leq a+X_{s-}^{2})}\left[g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)-g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)\right]^+\\\leq&\sum_{s\in D\cap[0,t]}\left(|g\left(X_{s-}^1,p_s\right)|+|g\left(X_{s-}^2,p_s\right)|\right)\\\leq&\int_0^t\int_U|g(X_{s-}^1,u)|N(ds,du)+\int_0^t\int_U|g(X_{s-}^2,u)|N(ds,du),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\int_U|g(X^1_{s-},u)|N(ds,du)\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\int_U|g(X^2_{s-},u)|N(ds,du)\right]\\ \leq&\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\int_U|g(X^1_{s-},u)|\mu(du)ds\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t\int_U|g(X^2_{s-},u)|\mu(du)ds\right]\\ <&2Kt,\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

thus

$$\lim_{a\to0+}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X^1_{s-}-X^2_{s-}\leq a)}(X^1_s-X^2_s-a)^+\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X^1_{s-}-X^2_{s-}\leq 0)}(X^1_s-X^2_s)^+\right].$$

Similarly,

$$\lim_{a\to0+}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X^1_{s-}-X^2_{s-}>a)}(X^1_s-X^2_s-a)^-\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{0<s\leq t}1_{(X^1_{s-}-X^2_{s-}>0)}(X^1_s-X^2_s)^-\right].$$

From the above, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[L^a_t(X^1-X^2)-L^0_t(X^1-X^2)\right]\to0,$$

i.e.

$$\lim_{a\to0+}\mathbb{E}[L^a_t(X^1-X^2)]=\mathbb{E}[L^0_t(X^1-X^2)].$$

□

In the sequel ρ always stands for a Borel map from $[0,\infty)$ to itself such that $\int_{0+}da/\rho(a)=\infty$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be a semimartingale. For $\varepsilon>0$ and $t>0$ define*

$$A^\varepsilon_t:=\int_0^t1_{(0<X_s\leq\varepsilon)}\rho(X_s)^{-1}d[X,X]^c_s.$$

If $\mathbb{E}A^\varepsilon_t<\infty$ and $\lim_{a\to0+}\mathbb{E}[L^a_t(X)]=\mathbb{E}[L^0_t(X)]$ for some $\varepsilon>0$ and all $t>0$, then $L^0(X)=0$.

Proof. Fix $t>0$. By the occupation times formula, which is introduced in Corollary 1 of Theorem 70 in [14], for any bounded measurable function g, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty L^a_tg(a)da=\int_0^tg(X_{s-})d[X,X]^c_s,$$

Then

$$A^\varepsilon_t=\int_0^\varepsilon\rho(a)^{-1}L^a_t(X)da.$$

Suppose $L^0_t(X)$ does not vanish a.s., then $\mathbb{E}L^0_t(X)$ is positive. Since $\mathbb{E}L^a_t(X)$ converges to $\mathbb{E}L^0_t(X)$ when a decreases to zero, and $\int_{0+}\frac{da}{\rho(a)}$ is non-integrable, we get $\mathbb{E}A^\varepsilon_t=\infty$, which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 4.2. *Pathwise uniqueness holds for (1.1) in the following cases:*

(1) Under conditions (3.a,b), and $|\sigma(x)-\sigma(y)|^2 \le \rho(|x-y|)$.

(2) Under conditions (3.a), (4.a,b), and $|\sigma(x)-\sigma(y)|^2 \le |f(x)-f(y)|$ *for some non-decreasing and bounded function* f.

Proof. We adopt similar arguments as those in Theorem 3.5 in [16].

(1) Under conditions (3.a,b), the weak uniqueness holds. Let X^1, X^2 be the solutions to (1.1) with respect to the same Brownian Motion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^1 - X_t^2 = X_0^1 - X_0^2 &+ \int_0^t \left(b(X_{s-}^1) - b(X_{s-}^2)\right) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \left(\sigma(X_{s-}^1) - \sigma(X_{s-}^2)\right) dB_s \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_U \left(g(X_{s-}^1, u) - g(X_{s-}^2, u)\right) N(ds, du), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \rho(X_s^1 - X_s^2)^{-1} 1_{(X_s^1 > X_s^2)} d[X^1 - X^2, X^1 - X^2]_s^c\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \rho(X_s^1 - X_s^2)^{-1} \left(\sigma(X_s^1) - \sigma(X_s^2)\right)^2 1_{(X_s^1 > X_s^2)} ds\right] \le t. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have $L^0(X^1 - X^2) = 0$. Hence, by Proposition 4.2, the pathwise uniqueness holds.

(2) Under conditions (3.a) and (4.b), the weak uniqueness holds. To prove the pathwise uniqueness, we need to prove that $L^0(X^2 - X^1) = 0$. To apply Lemma 4.2, we will consider A_t with $\varepsilon = \infty$, $\rho(x) = x$ and $X_t = X_t^1 - X_t^2$. We consider

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \quad \left[\int_0^t (X_s^1 - X_s^2)^{-1} d[X^1 - X^2, X^1 - X^2]_s^c\right] \\ &\le \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \left(f(X_s^1) - f(X_s^2)\right) (X_s^1 - X_s^2)^{-1} ds\right] =: K(f)_t \end{aligned}$$

Now we construct a sequence of smooth functions to approximate $K(f)_t$. Let

$$f_n(x) = \mathbb{E} f(x + \xi_n), \quad \xi_n \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n}).$$

It is easy to verify that f_n is of bounded and increasing. Denote

$$Z = \{x : f(x) \text{ is discontinuous at } x\},$$

which is a countable set. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = f(x), \forall x \notin Z$. By the occupation times formula

$$0 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} L_t^a 1_{\{a\in Z\}} da = \int_0^t 1_{\{X_{s-}\in Z\}} d[X,X]_s^c$$

we have

$$0 = \int_0^t 1_{\{X_{s-}\in Z\}} \sigma^2(X_{s-}) ds \geq \sigma_0^2 \int_0^t 1_{\{X_{s-}\in Z\}} ds = \sigma_0^2 \text{Leb}\{s : X_{s-} \in Z\}.$$

Then $\text{Leb}\{s : X_{s-} \in Z\} = 0, a.s.$, and hence $\text{Leb}\{s : X_{s-} \in Z \text{ or } X_s \neq X_{s-}\} = 0, a.s.$. Consequently

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(f_n(X_s^1) - f_n(X_s^2)\right) = f(X_s^1) - f(X_s^2)$$

for almost all $s \leq t$. It follows that $K(f)_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} K(f_n)_t$.

For $v \in [0,1]$, set $Z_t^v = X_t^2 + v(X_t^1 - X_t^2)$. Then

$$Z_t^v = Z_0^v + \int_0^t b_{s-}^v ds + \int_0^t \sigma_{s-}^v dB_s + \int_0^t \int_U g_{s-}^v(u)\, N(ds,du), \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_{s-}^v &= vb(X_{s-}^1) + (1-v)b(X_{s-}^2), \\ \sigma_{s-}^v &= v\sigma(X_{s-}^1) + (1-v)\sigma(X_{s-}^2), \\ g_{s-}^v(u) &= vg(X_{s-}^1, u) + (1-v)g(X_{s-}^2, u). \end{aligned}$$

Since $[Z^v, Z^v]_t^c = \int_0^t \sigma^v(Z_{s-}^v)^2 ds$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} K(f_n)_t &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t f_n'(Z_s^v) ds\right] dv \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t f_n'(Z_s^v)\sigma^v(Z_{s-}^v)^{-2} d[Z^v, Z^v]_s^c\right] dv \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2}\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t f_n'(Z_s^v) d[Z^v, Z^v]_s^c\right] dv \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2}\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_n'(a) L_t^a(Z^v) da\right] dv. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Moreover, $|\sigma^v| \leq M, |b^v| \leq M$, by Tanaka's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_t^v - a)^+ =& (Z_0^v - a)^+ + \int_0^t 1_{(Z_{s-}^v > a)} \left(b_{s-}^v ds + \sigma_{s-}^v dB_s + \int_U g_{s-}^v(u) N(ds,du)\right) \\ &+ \sum_{0<s\leq t} 1_{(Z_{s-}^v > a)} (Z_s^v - a)^- + \sum_{0<s\leq t} 1_{(Z_{s-}^v \leq a)} (Z_t^v - a)^+ + \frac{1}{2} L_t^a(Z^v). \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}L_t^a(Z^v) \leq \mathbb{E}(Z_t^v - a)^+ + \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |b_{s-}^v|ds + \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \int_U |g_{s-}^v(u)|N(ds,du) < \infty, \tag{4.24}$$

i.e.

$$\sup_{a,v} E\left[L_t^a(Z^v)\right] = C < \infty.$$

It follows from (4.22) that

$$K(f_n)_t \leq \sigma_0^{-2} C \sup_n \|f_n\|.$$

Hence $K(f)_t$ is bounded by a constant. By Lemma 4.2, we have $L^0(X^1 - X^2) = 0$. Since the weak uniqueness has been proved in Section 3, by Proposition 4.2, the pathwise uniqueness holds.

□

Remark 4.1. *The condition (2) of Theorem 4.2 is equivalent to the following:*

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^2 \leq |h(x) - h(y)| \tag{4.25}$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is of bounded variation.

In fact, if (4.25) holds, we can write h as the difference $f_1 - f_2$ of two non-decreasing functions. It is easy to prove condition (2) for $f = f_1 + f_2$.

5 An application

A modern approach in ruin theory is to work with a spectrally negative Lévy process to describe the surplus of an insurance company/portfolio. In the actuarial literature, these Lévy processes with negative jumps are also called Lévy insurance risk processes.

The following equation defines the so-called refracted Lévy process

$$dU_t = -\delta 1_{\{U_t > b\}} dt + dX_t \tag{5.26}$$

where $X = \{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a Lévy process with law $\mathbb{P}$ and $b, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the resulting process U may visit the half line (b, ∞) with positive probability.

Note that the equation (5.26) is motivated by application in actuary. In fact, X_t is the surplus process without dividend given by the form

$$dX_t = \mu dt + \sigma dB_t + dJ_t$$

where μ is the average premium collection rate; the second term comes from uncertainty of premium collection or other random factors, i.e., the insured will pay the premium with certain probability, and a scaling limit leads to this term; J_t is the accumulated claims up

to time t. δ is the rate of dividend, i.e., the insurance company will pay dividend when the surplus is higher than a certain level. To summarize, the equation can be rewritten as

$$dU_t = ((\mu - \delta)1_{U_t \geq b} + \mu 1_{U_t < b})\, dt + \sigma dB_t + dJ_t.$$

Kyprianou and Loeffen [11] investigates the ruin problem of (5.26) by establishing a few identities, written in terms of scale functions for the case of one and two sided exit problems. They proved that the refracted Lévy processes exists as the unique strong solution whenever X is a spectrally negative Lévy process.

Note that the company with higher reserve has less risk. Therefore, we enrich the model by considering discontinuous diffusion term. Namely, when the reserve process $X_t \geq q$ for a constant q, the volatility constant is σ_1 which is (usually) lower than the volatility constant σ_2 when $X_t < q$. Namely, we consider the following SDE:

$$dX_t = (\mu_1 1_{X_t \geq p} + \mu_2 1_{X_t < p})dt + (\sigma_1 1_{X_t \geq q} + \sigma_2 1_{X_t < q})dB_t + dJ_t, \tag{5.27}$$

where J_t is pure jump spectrally negative Lévy process. p, q, σ_1 and σ_2 are positive constants.

Using the results of previous sections, we proceed to proving that (5.27) has a unique strong solution. For simplicity of notation, we denote

$$b(x) = \mu_1 1_{x \geq p} + \mu_2 1_{x < p}, \quad \sigma(x) = \sigma_1 1_{x \geq q} + \sigma_2 1_{x < q}.$$

It is clear that $b(x), \sigma(x)$ have at most countably many discontinuous points. It is easy to verify that (5.27) satisfies weak uniqueness. To prove the pathwise uniqueness, let

$$f(x) = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 1_{(x > q)}.$$

Then,

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^2 \leq |f(x) - f(y)|.$$

Note that $f(x)$ is a bounded and increasing function, which satisfies the (LT) condition. With the weak uniqueness and local time condition, we conclude that the pathwise uniqueness holds for (5.27) .

References

[1] D. Aldous. Stopping times anf tightness. Ann. Probab. 6, 335-340, 1978.

[2] M.T. Barlow and E. Perkins, One-dimensional stochastic differential equations involving a singular increasing process. Stochastics 12, 229-242, 1984.

[3] R.F. Bass, K. Burdzy and Z. Q. Chen. Stochastic differential equations driven by stable processes for which pathwise uniqueness fails. Stochastic Process. Appl. 111. 1-15, 2004.

[4] R.F. Bass. Stochastic differential equations driven by symmetric stable processes. Séminaire de Probabilités, Vol. XXXVI. Springer, New York, pp. 302-313, 2003.

[5] S. Bouhadou and Y. Ouknine. Stochastic equations of processes with jumps. Stochastics and Dynamics. Vol. 14, No, 1, 2014.

[6] Z.F. Fu, Z.H. Li. Stochastic equations of non-negative processes with jumps. Stochastic Processes and their applications, 3: 306-330, 2010.

[7] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe. Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes, 2nd. North-Holland, 1989.

[8] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. Limit theorems for Stochastic Processes. Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[9] T. Komatsu. On the pathwise uniqueness of solutions of one-dimensional stochastic differential equations of jump type. Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., 58, pp. 353-356, 1982.

[10] T.G. Kurtz and D.L. Ocone. Unique characterization of conditional distributions in nonlinear filtering. The annals of probability, Vol. 16, No. 1, 80-107, 1988.

[11] A. E. Kyprianou and R. L. Loeffen. Refracted Lévy processes. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 46(1), 24-44, 2010.

[12] J.F. Le Gall, Applications du temps local aux équations différentielles stochastiques unidimensionnelles. (French) [Local time applications to one-dimensional stochastic differential equations] Seminar on Probability, Vol. XVII, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 986, pp. 15-31, 1983.

[13] Z. Li and L. Mytnik. Strong solutions for stochastic differential equations with jumps. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 47, 1055-1067, 2011.

[14] P.E. Protter. Stochastic integration and differential equations, 2nd edn. Applications of Mathematics (New York), Vol. 21. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, Springer-Verlag, 2004.

[15] H. Ren. Pathwise uniqueness of one-dimensional SDEs driven by one-side stable processes, 2013.

[16] D. Revuz, M. Yor. Continous martingales and Brownian motion. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[17] T. Yamada, S. Watanabe. On the uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 11, 155-167. MR0278420, 1971.